

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF ENERGY & ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
ONE WINTER STREET, BOSTON, MA 02108 617-292-5500

THE OFFICE OF APPEALS AND DISPUTE RESOLUTION

September 24, 2008

In the Matter of
Scotty Thyng

OADR Docket Nos. 2005-024 & 2005-033
DEP File No. 059-0938
Quincy, MA

RECOMMENDED FINAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION

These two appeals challenge a Superseding Order of Conditions (“SOC”) that the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (“MassDEP” or “the Department”) issued in February 2005 to Scotty Thyng (“Mr. Thyng” or “the Applicant”) pursuant to the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act, G.L. c. 131, § 40 (“MWPA”), and the Wetlands Regulations at 310 CMR 10.00, et seq. The SOC authorized Mr. Thyng’s construction of a single-family home, associated utilities, and a parking pad (“the Project”) on real property located at 202 Manet Avenue, Quincy, Massachusetts (“the Property”). See SOC, at p. 1.

The Project had previously been before the City of Quincy Conservation Commission (“the QCC”) for review but the QCC failed to issue a decision on the Project within 21 days after the QCC’s public hearing on the Project had concluded. *Id.* The QCC’s failure to act on the

Project caused Mr. Thyng to seek Department review of the Project pursuant to the MWPA and the Wetlands Regulations. Id.¹

An SOC from the Department authorizing the Project was necessary because the Property was located in a coastal bank area subject to protection under the MWPA and Wetlands Regulations.² Although he obtained the requisite SOC from the Department, Mr. Thyng “conditionally” appealed the SOC to MassDEP’s Office of Appeals and Dispute Resolution (“OADR”) because the SOC purportedly has the incorrect date for the Notice of Intent (“NOI”) that he previously filed for the Project with the QCC. See OADR Docket No. 2005-024. His neighbors on Manet Avenue in Quincy, Joseph and Janet Bargar (“the Bargar’s”), also appealed the SOC contending that construction of the home at the Property will purportedly harm surrounding wetlands in violation of the MWPA and Wetlands Regulations. See OADR Docket No. 2005-033. The Bargar’s live directly across the street from the Property at 205 Manet Avenue.

I recommend that MassDEP’s Commissioner issue a Final Decision affirming the SOC and dismissing Mr. Thyng’s and the Bargar’s respective appeals for the following reasons.

First, Mr. Thyng’s appeal should be dismissed because on June 19, 2008, he filed a Notice of Withdrawal of his appeal “based on [purported] representations from the Department concerning [their purported] settlement discussions.” His Notice of Withdrawal should be treated as a statement under 310 CMR 1.01(6)(e) that he has withdrawn his appeal or does not intend to proceed with prosecution of the appeal. His appeal should also be dismissed pursuant

¹ As discussed below, at pp. 6-8, the QCC subsequently denied the Project pursuant the City of Quincy Wetlands By-Law and Mr. Thyng prevailed in his Superior Court appeal of the QCC’s action.

² A “coastal bank” is a coastal wetland “subject to tidal action or coastal storm flowage” G.L. c. 131, § 40; 310 CMR 10.30.

310 CMR 1.01(10) because he has failed to prosecute the appeal and comply with my directive requiring him to file a proper Pre-Hearing Statement setting forth his positions in the appeal. His standing to appeal the SOC as an “aggrieved person” is also suspect because the SOC approved the Project.³

The Bargars’ appeal should also be dismissed because they have failed to substantiate their claims notwithstanding that they have the burden of proof in their appeal, and notwithstanding the opportunities that I have provided to them to set forth a minimal factual and legal basis for their appeal.

GOVERNING STATUTORY AND REGULATORY SCHEME

I. THE BURDEN OF PROOF IN AN APPEAL CHALLENGING AN SOC

Mr. Thyng and the Bargars filed their respective appeals in 2005, and, accordingly, resolution of their appeals is governed by the Wetland Permit Appeal Regulations in effect prior to October 31, 2007. On October 31, 2007, the Department adopted streamlined Wetland Permit Appeal Regulations at 310 CMR 10.05(7)(j) requiring resolution of Wetland Permit Appeals filed on or after that date within six months of their filing unless the Appeals have been stayed because a project has been denied under a local Wetlands By-Law. See e.g. Department’s Wetlands Policy 89-1.⁴ The Department adopted the streamlined Wetland Permit Appeal Regulations because delays in Wetland Permit Appeals are costly to private and public parties involved in the permitting process. See Wetlands Appeal Streamlining Regulations, Preamble,

³ See footnote 5 below, at p. 4.

⁴ Department’s Wetlands Policy 89-1 is discussed below, at pp. 6-7.

October 31, 2007; 310 CMR 10.05(7)(j), effective October 31, 2007.

Although the timeline for resolving Wetland Permit Appeals has changed, the burden of proof in those Appeals has not changed. Under the previous and current regulations, the party challenging an SOC (“the appellant” or “the petitioner”) has the burden of proof on all issues, including whether the party has standing to appeal the SOC as an “aggrieved person”⁵ and whether the Department improperly issued the SOC. See 310 CMR 10.03(2); 310 CMR 10.04; 310 CMR 10.05(7)(j)2.b.iv; 310 CMR 10.05(7)(j)2.b.v; 310 CMR 10.05(7)(j)3.a; 310 CMR 10.05(7)(j)3.b. This means that the petitioner must “produce at least some credible evidence from a competent source in support of [the petitioner’s] position[s].” 310 CMR 10.03(2); 310 CMR 10.04; 310 CMR 10.05(7)(j)3.b; compare, Standerwick, 447 Mass. at 37 (plaintiff’s case cannot consist of “unfounded speculation to support their claims of injury”). Indeed, in challenging MassDEP’s factual determinations in the SOC, the petitioner must present “credible evidence from a competent source in support of each claim of factual error, including any relevant expert report(s), plan(s), or photograph(s).” 310 CMR 10.05(7)(j)3.c.

II. THE CASE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY OF PRESIDING OFFICERS

A. The Presiding Officer’s Pre-Screening Authority

Under 310 CMR 1.01(5)(a)15, the Presiding Officer in an appeal is authorized to conduct a pre-screening conference with the parties to discuss potential settlement of the appeal and the issues for resolution in the appeal if it cannot be settled by agreement of the parties. 310 CMR

⁵ An “aggrieved person” is “any person who, because of an act or failure to act by the [Department in issuing the SOC], may suffer an injury in fact which is different either in kind or magnitude from that suffered by the general public and which is within the scope of the interests identified in M.G.L. c. 131, § 40.” 310 CMR 10.04; compare, Standerwick v. Zoning Board of Appeals of Andover, 447 Mass. 20, 33-37 (2006) (plaintiff appealing zoning decision “[must] prove standing, which requires that the plaintiff ‘establish -- by direct facts and not by speculative personal opinion -- that his injury is special and different from the concerns of the rest of the community’”). If a party is not an aggrieved person, its appeal of an SOC should be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

1.01(5)(a)15; 310 CMR 10.05(7)(j)7.g.⁶ To assist the Presiding Officer in identifying the issues for resolution in the appeal and managing the proceedings in the appeal, the Presiding Officer’s pre-screening authority includes the power to “issu[e] orders to parties, *including without limitation*, ordering parties to show cause, ordering parties to . . . atten[d] prescreening conferences[,] and ordering parties to provide more definite statements in support of their positions.” 310 CMR 1.01(5)(a)15 (emphasis supplied). It also includes the power to require the parties to file a Pre-hearing Statement setting forth their respective positions in the case, including, but not limited to:

- a concise summary of the evidence that will be offered by the parties;
- the facts agreed upon by the parties;
- contested issues of fact and law; and
- a list of witnesses to be called, including the designation of those who will be offered as expert witnesses, and a brief summary of the testimony of each witness.

See also 310 CMR 1.01(9)(b).

B. Enforcement of the Presiding Officer’s Orders

Under 310 CMR 1.01(11)(a)2.f, a “Presiding Officer may summarily dismiss a case *sua sponte*,” when the petitioner fails to prosecute the appeal or fails to comply with an order issued

⁶ Under the streamlined Wetland Permit Appeal Regulations, pre-screening conferences are mandatory. The regulations at 310 CMR 10.05(7)(j)7.a and 7.b provide that “[u]pon receipt of [an] Appeal Notice, the Presiding Officer will schedule” two events: (1) “a prescreening conference to be conducted [with the parties] pursuant to 310 CMR 1.01(5)(a)15” within 30 days after the appeal’s filing, and (2) a hearing in the appeal to be conducted within 120 days after the appeal’s filing. “All parties must attend [the pre-screening conference] and be prepared to discuss settlement and the narrowing of issues” for resolution at the subsequent evidentiary hearing. 310 CMR 10.05(7)(j)7.g. For any appeal not resolved at the pre-screening conference, “the Presiding Officer [is to issue] a pre-screening conference report . . . containing a list of issues that are in dispute and which are legally relevant, and that are to be addressed in the parties’ direct and rebuttal cases” for the hearing. *Id.*

by the Presiding Officer. For the same reasons, the Presiding Officer may also dismiss an appeal pursuant to 310 CMR 1.01(5)(a)15 and 310 CMR 1.01(10)(e).

The Presiding Officer may also impose sanctions on a party where “[the] party . . . demonstrates an intention to delay the proceeding[s] or resolution of the proceedings” in an appeal. 310 CMR 1.01(10). This includes a party who files pleadings or other papers in an appeal “interposed for delay,” 310 CMR 1.01(4)(b), or containing “impertinent or scandalous matter.” 310 CMR 1.01(11)(c).

The range of sanctions that a Presiding Officer may impose on a party, include, “without limitation,” an order:

- (a) designating facts or issues as established against the party being sanctioned;
- (b) prohibiting the party being sanctioned from supporting or opposing designated claims or defenses, or introducing designated matters into evidence;
- (c) denying summarily late-filed motions or motions failing to comply with 310 CMR 1.01(4);
- (d) striking pleadings in whole or in part;⁷
- (e) dismissing the appeal as to some or all of the disputed issues;
- (f) dismissing the party being sanctioned from the appeal; and/or
- (g) issuing a final decision against the party being sanctioned.

310 CMR 1.01(10).

III. DEPARTMENT’S WETLANDS POLICY 89-1

The MWPA “establishes Statewide minimum wetlands protection standards, [but] local

⁷ Under 310 CMR 1.01(11)(c), “the Presiding Officer may [also] strike from a pleading any insufficient allegation or defense or any redundant, irrelevant, immaterial, impertinent or scandalous matter.”

communities are free to impose more stringent requirements” by enacting local Wetlands Protection By-Laws. Oyster Creek Preservation, Inc. v. Conservation Commission of Harwich, 449 Mass. 859, 866 (2007). As a result, an SOC issued by MassDEP under the MWPA cannot preempt a timely decision of a local conservation commission denying approval of a project based “on provisions of a local bylaw that are more protective than the [MWPA].” Id. The SOC, however, will preempt the more protective local By-Law if the local conservation commission’s denial of the project was untimely. Id.

The Department’s Wetlands Policy 89-1 provides that “the Department will stay administrative action on any Request for an Adjudicatory Hearing in a wetlands permit case when the project has been denied under a local wetlands bylaw[.] . . .” The stay provision of Wetlands Policy 89-1 is supported by 310 CMR 1.01(6)(h), which provides that “the Presiding Officer shall stay administratively any appeal of a superseding determination or order of conditions issued under M.G.L. c. 131, § 40 when the determination or order is denied under a local wetlands bylaw and the denial is appealed to court.” Under 310 CMR 1.01(5)(a)3 and 310 CMR 1.01(5)(a)15.d, a Presiding Officer may also stay the proceedings in a Wetlands Permit Appeal “where the failure to previously obtain a final decision required under another law would result in an unnecessary expenditure of the Department’s administrative resources, or for other good cause.”

PRIOR PROCEEDINGS

For three years after their filing, Mr. Thyng’s and the Bargars’ respective appeals were stayed pursuant to Department’s Wetlands Policy 89-1 and 310 CMR 1.01(6)(h) pending the outcome of Mr. Thyng’s Superior Court appeal of the QCC’s denial of the Project pursuant to the City of Quincy’s Wetlands By-Law. See Thyng v. Quincy Conservation Commission,

Norfolk Superior Court Civil Action No. NOCV2004-01485. On March 29, 2006, a Superior Court judge remanded the matter to the QCC for a further hearing on Mr. Thyng's Project. Id. The QCC, however, failed to comply with the Court's order, and, as a result, on January 7, 2008, the Court vacated the QCC's initial Order of Conditions ("OOC") denying Mr. Thyng's Project under the Quincy Wetland By-Law, and ruled that "the [SOC] of the DEP governs" the Project. Id. The Court ruled:

[t]he Conservation Commission offers no reason, other than animosity toward Plaintiff, for not scheduling the matter for hearing. Furthermore, the original [OCC] denying the [Project] was late and therefore of no effect. . . .

The QCC did not appeal the Court's judgment. I then lifted the stay of Mr. Thyng's and the Bargars' respective appeals of the SOC before OADR.

In accordance with my Pre-Screening authority under 310 CMR 1.01(5)(a)15, on April 8, 2008, I issued a Scheduling Order to the parties that scheduled the appeals for a Pre-Screening Conference on June 10, 2008 and an evidentiary Hearing on September 9, 2008. Scheduling Order, ¶¶ 3 and 10. The Scheduling Order informed the parties that I would meet with them at the June 10, 2008 Pre-Screening Conference to discuss whether the appeals could be settled by agreement of the parties, and to identify the issues for resolution at the evidentiary Hearing if the appeals could not be settled. Scheduling Order, ¶ 3. To facilitate settlement discussions, the Scheduling Order directed the parties to confer prior to the Pre-Screening Conference "to discuss the possibility of settlement of these appeals, and the amenability of these appeals to mediation or other forms of alternative dispute resolution." Scheduling Order, ¶ 5. Specifically, I ordered the following:

In OADR Docket No. 2005-024, it shall be Mr. Thyng's responsibility to initiate settlement discussions at least ten (10) calendar days prior to the Pre-Screening

Conference. The settlement discussions may be conducted in person, or by the telephone.

In OADR Docket No. 2005-033, it shall be the responsibility of the Bargars to initiate settlement discussions at least ten (10) calendar days prior to the Pre-Screening Conference. The settlement discussions may be conducted in person, or by the telephone.

The Scheduling Order made clear that “[t]he failure of any party . . . to comply with any requirements of th[e] [Scheduling] Order [would] result in the imposition of appropriate sanctions on that party pursuant to 310 CMR 1.01(10).” Scheduling Order, ¶ 4. The Scheduling Order put Mr. Thyng and the Bargars on notice that the range of sanctions included possible dismissal of their respective appeals if they failed to comply with the Scheduling Order. *Id.*

Neither Mr. Thyng nor the Bargars complied with the good faith settlement directives of the Scheduling Order. During the first week after I issued my Scheduling Order, Mr. Thyng left a number of electronic mail or telephone messages with OADR’s Case Administrator expressing less than complimentary comments for the Bargars and Department personnel. The Bargars also left electronic mail or telephone messages with OADR’s Case Administrator expressing their displeasure with Mr. Thyng.

On April 15, 2008, I issued an Order directing Mr. Thyng and the Bargars to immediately cease their behavior and comply with the directives of the Scheduling Order, including the settlement directives. My Order made clear to them that “[t]he failure of Mr. Thyng or the Bargars to comply with any requirements of the Scheduling Order and [my April 15, 2008] Order [would] result in dismissal of their respective appeal pursuant to 310 CMR 1.01(10).”

After I entered my April 15, 2008 Order, Mr. Thyng and the Bargars continued their previous course of conduct as evidenced by their filings with OADR. For example, Mr. Thyng filed among, other things, a “Motion to Allow Interrogatories and Depositions,” and a “Motion

to Strike [the] Bargar[s'] [PreHearing] Statement and [to] Dismiss [their Appeal] as [a] Sanction.”

Mr. Thyng and the Bargars also failed to comply with the Scheduling Order’s requirement that they file Pre-Hearing Statements prior to the June 10, 2008 Pre-Screening Conference setting forth their respective positions in the appeals. Scheduling Order, ¶¶ 7-8. The Scheduling Order required Mr. Thyng and the Bargars to file a Pre-Hearing Statement in their respective appeals containing the following information:

- (1) a brief summary of the SOC being appealed;
- (2) a brief summary of the final relief that [each] party [was] seek[ing] in [their respective] appeal[s];
- (3) a list of disputed relevant facts for resolution in each appeal and the party’s position on each issue (what the party expect[ed] to prove at the Hearing on the appeal);
- (4) a list of legal issues for resolution in each appeal, and the party’s position on the issue; and
- (5) the names and addresses of each party’s witnesses, including expert witnesses, who will be filing Pre-filed Testimony.⁸ . . .

Scheduling Order, ¶ 8. The Scheduling Order

Mr. Thyng’s June 2, 2008 Pre-Hearing Statement in his appeal (OADR Docket No. 2005-024) merely asserted that “[t]he issues [in his appeal] revolve around questions and documents never addressed by the Department as promised,” and “[t]hese questions are fundamental to the

⁸ The Scheduling Order informed the parties that:

[t]he only witnesses who will be permitted to testify at the Hearing are those individuals who have filed timely Pre-filed Testimony in the appeal. A party’s failure to list a witness in the Pre-Hearing Statement may lead to an order precluding the testimony of that witness unless the party demonstrates good cause for having omitted the individual from the witness list.

Scheduling Order, ¶ 8 n. 5, at p. 8.

issues of the Appeal for Failure to Act.” Mr. Thyng’s Pre-Hearing Statement failed to list any witnesses that would file Pre-filed Testimony and testify at the Hearing in his appeal. He failed to list those witnesses notwithstanding that he has “the burden of going forward” or the burden of proof in his appeal under 310 CMR 10.03(2).

The Bargars’ June 4, 2008 Pre-Hearing Statement in their appeal (OADR Docket No. 2005-033) sought to re-litigate issues that were resolved against them in Mr. Thyng’s previous Superior Court action against the QCC. For instance, for relief in their appeal, the Bargars requested an Order directing Mr. Thyng to re-file an application for approval of the Project with the QCC, the same entity that the Superior Court had ruled was not favorably disposed towards Mr. Thyng. The Bargars also wanted the Project to be subject to the Quincy Wetlands By-Law even though the Superior Court had ruled that the By-Law had no application. Lastly, the Bargars failed to list any witnesses in their Pre-Hearing Memorandum that would file Pre-filed Testimony and testify at the Hearing in their appeal. They failed to list those witnesses notwithstanding their burden of proof under 310 CMR 10.03(2).

As a result of Mr. Thyng’s and the Bargars’ failure to file proper Pre-Hearing Statements that would assist me in determining whether their respective appeals had any good faith basis, on June 9, 2008, I cancelled the June 10th Pre-Screening Conference. I also issued an Order to Show Cause [“the June 9th Order”] directing Mr. Thyng and the Bargars to demonstrate by June 20, 2008 why their respective appeals should not be dismissed.

Mr. Thyng responded to my June 9th Order by filing a “Notice of Withdrawal of [his] Appeal” on June 19, 2008 which stated that he was “withdraw[ing] [his] appeal based on [purported] representations from the Department concerning [their purported] settlement

discussions.” Mr. Thyng, however, did not set forth the representations that the Department’s representatives purportedly made to him.

The Bargars responded to my June 9th Order by forwarding an e-mail message to OADR on June 20, 2008 indicating that they wished to go forward with their appeal because “a coastal bank on the [Property] [purportedly] ha[d] not been adequately delineated by Mr. Thyng,” and, as a result, “Mr. Thyng’s proposed project *could* negatively impact that coastal bank.” (emphasis supplied). The Bargars contended that they “ha[d] retained the services of a wetlands consultant to assist [them] in th[eir] [appeal] and to provide expert testimony” at the Hearing. They provided the name of their purported wetlands consultant, and contended that he “plan[ned] to view Mr. Thyng’s property [during the] next week from adjoining properties in order to view the coastal bank on the site.” The Bargars contended that their “efforts . . . demonstrate[d] [their] commitment to meeting [their] obligations in [their] appeal”

It has been more than three months since the Bargars forwarded their June 20, 2008 e-mail to OADR as described above. As of this date, the Bargars have not supplemented their e-mail message with any information from their purported wetlands consultant.

DISCUSSION

MassDEP’s COMMISSIONER SHOULD ISSUE A FINAL DECISION DISMISSING BOTH APPEALS AND AFFIRMING THE SOC.

The prior proceedings as discussed above at pp. 7-12 warrant dismissal of Mr. Thyng’s and the Bargars’ respective appeals, and affirmance of the SOC.

In Mr. Thyng’s case, he has expressed a written desire to withdraw his appeal. His statement is in essence as a statement under 310 CMR 1.01(6)(e) that he has withdrawn his appeal or does not intend to proceed with prosecution of the appeal. He also failed to comply

with my April 2008 Scheduling Order directing him to set forth in his positions in the appeal. Hence, his appeal should be dismissed pursuant 310 CMR 1.01(10) for failure to prosecute. I also question Mr. Thyng's standing to pursue his appeal because he has not been harmed by the SOC; the SOC approved his Project after the QCC failed to act on his request for approval of the Project pursuant to the MWPA and the Wetlands Regulations.

In the Bargars' case, it appears they have used the appeal process at OADR to delay the Project. Eight months ago in January 2008, the Superior Court made clear that Quincy's Wetlands By-Law would have no application to the Project, and that the SOC would solely govern the Project. Notwithstanding the Superior Court's judgment, when I lifted the stay in their OADR appeal of the SOC, the Bargars wanted Mr. Thyng to begin anew before the QCC and be subject to Quincy's Wetlands By-Law. When I took them to task for taking that position, the Bargars switched course and asserted that a coastal bank at the Property had not been properly delineated by Mr. Thyng and that the "project *could* negatively impact that coastal bank." (emphasis supplied).

The Bargars promised to back up their coastal bank claim with information from a wetlands consultant. To date, the Bargars have not supplied any information from that purported consultant.

In sum, it is appropriate for me to conclude that the Bargars:

[have] fail[ed] to file documents as required, respond to notices, . . . comply with orders issued and schedules established in orders[,] [and have] fail[ed] to prosecute th[eir] . . . appeal; demonstrate[d] an intention not to proceed [with their appeal]; and demonstrate[d] an intention to delay the proceeding[s] or resolution of the proceedings [in their appeal].

310 CMR 1.01(10). Accordingly, I recommend that MassDEP's Commissioner issue a Final

Decision dismissing the Bargars' appeal and affirming the SOC.

Dismissal of the Bargars' appeal and affirmance of the SOC would also be appropriate because the Bargars have failed to demonstrate that they have standing to appeal the SOC as aggrieved persons. Notwithstanding their burden of proof, the Bargars have failed to demonstrate how their specific wetlands interests are affected by construction of the proposed single family home on the Property. Put another way, the Bargars have failed to show that the new home will harm wetlands interests in a manner unique to them.

Even if they have standing to appeal the SOC as aggrieved persons, the Bargars have not presented any reliable evidence demonstrating that the SOC violates the MWPA and the Wetlands Regulations. They had the burden of presenting that evidence. Having failed to present that evidence, their appeal of the SOC should fail.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, I recommend that MassDEP's Commissioner issue a Final Decision affirming the SOC and dismissing Mr. Thyng's and the Bargars' respective appeals of the SOC.

NOTICE- RECOMMENDED FINAL DECISION

This decision is a Recommended Final Decision of the Presiding Officer. It has been transmitted to the Commissioner for her Final Decision in this matter. This decision is therefore not a Final Decision subject to reconsideration under 310 CMR 1.01(14)(e), and may not be appealed to Superior Court pursuant to M.G.L. c. 30A. The Commissioner's Final Decision is subject to rights of reconsideration and court appeal and will contain a notice to that effect.

Because this matter has now been transmitted to the Commissioner, no party shall file a

motion to renew or reargue this Recommended Final Decision or any part of it, and no party shall communicate with the Commissioner's office regarding this decision unless the Commissioner, in her sole discretion, directs otherwise.

This final document copy is being provided to you electronically by the Department of Environmental Protection. A signed copy of this document is on file at the DEP office listed on the letterhead.

Date: _____

Salvatore M. Giorlandino
Acting Chief Presiding Officer

SERVICE LIST

In The Matter Of: Scotty Thyng
Docket No. 2005-024 File No. 059-0938
Docket No. 2005-033 File No. 059-0938

Representative

Party

Scotty Thyng
P.O. Box 990813
Boston, MA 02199-0813
scotty@compuserve.com

APPLICANT/PETITIONER (2005-024)
APPLICANT (2005-033)

Joseph and Janet Bargar
205 Manet Avenue
Quincy, MA 02189
jbargar@comcast.net

PETITIONERS (2005-033)

Samuel J. Bennett, Esq.
DEP – Office of General Counsel
One Winter Street, 3rd Floor
Boston, MA 02108
Samuel.Bennett@state.ma.us

DEPARTMENT
Dept. of Environmental Protection

Cc:
Michael Abell
DEP – Northeast Regional Office
205B Lowell Street
Wilmington, MA 01887
Michael.abell@state.ma.us

DEPARTMENT
Dept. of Environmental Protection

Quincy Conservation Commission
City Hall, 1305 Hancock Street
Quincy, MA 02169
hsargent@ci.quincy.ma.us

CONCOM

Robert Quinn
Quincy City Solicitors Office
City Hall, 1305 Hancock Street
Quincy, MA 02169
rquinn@ci.quincy.ma.us